

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 2-9 have been amended to improve clarity of the claimed invention and claims 10-17 have been added further defining the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 2-17 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1 and 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,421 to Stolarz ("Stolarz"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Stolarz generally describes a means for locating the virtual file folders in a three dimensional address structure having an X-axis with a plurality of first descriptors, a Y-axis with a plurality of second descriptors and a Z-axis with a plurality of third descriptors. See column 3, lines 8-15 of Stolarz. Each of the virtual file folders is classified into one of the first descriptors, one of the second descriptors and one of the third descriptors. However, referring to independent claims 2 and 6-9, Stolarz fails to teach or suggest, "the three-dimensional space data production unit encloses each of the objects positioned in the apparent three-dimensional space display within a frame of a uniform size and reduces or enlarges the frame and the objects enclosed therein depending on a distance of the three-dimensional space from a vantage point outside the three-dimensional space". Lines 3-6 of abstract and FIGS. 15A-P of Stolarz fail to teach or suggest, "wherein each of the objects positioned in the apparent three-dimensional space display is enclosed within a frame of a uniform size," as recited in independent claims 2 and 6-9 of the presently claimed invention. In Stolarz, the "frame" itself seems to indicate the "file". On the other hand, the frame in the claim encloses each object as shown in FIG. 6 and the corresponding description in the specification of the present invention.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at page 5, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Stolarz and U.S. Patent No. 6,535,232 to Tsuda et al. ("Tsuda"). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 2 in view of Stolarz are incorporated herein. Tsuda generally describes an object generation unit for generating an object based on three-dimensional object data externally input, an object position determination unit that moves the generated object according to a user input, and thereby determines an object position, a view point position determination unit that moves a view point according to the user input and thereby determines a view point position, a distance calculation unit for calculating a distance from the object position and the view point position, a frame rate determination unit for determining a frame rate corresponding to the calculated distance on the basis of a set table or formula, and a frame rate control unit and a moving image generation unit for reproducing the moving image with the frame rate of moving image data externally input reduced. See abstract.

However, Tsuda is silent as to teaching or suggesting, " reduces or enlarges the frame and the objects enclosed therein depending on a distance of the three-dimensional space from a vantage point outside the three-dimensional space," as recited in independent claim 2. The "frame" in Tsuda is one of frames in moving image, and is completely different from the "frame" that encloses an object positioned in the apparent three-dimensional space according to the present invention. Thus, even if Stolarz and Tsuda were combined, the combination would not provide for all the claimed features of independent claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to independent claim 2 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, at page 6, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Stolarz and U.S. Patent No. 5,982,372 to Brush, II et al. ("Brush"). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 3 in view of Stolarz are incorporated herein. As to amended independent claims 3, 10, 12, 14 and 16, Brush generally describes providing move-to coordinates in order to prevent avatar overlap. However, Brush fails to teach or suggest, "disperses positional coordinates of each object and reduces the display size of each object positioned within the apparent three-dimensional space display preventing object data to be displayed in an overlapped state when the objects have identical or contiguous coordinates and when a distance of the three-dimensional space from a vantage point is within a range." It is respectfully requested that independent claims 3, 10,



12, 14 and 16 be allowed.

In the Office Action, at page 7, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Stolarz and U.S. Patent No. 6,262,694 to Ishimoto et al. ("Ishimoto"). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 4 in view of Stolarz are incorporated herein. Ishimoto provides an image display system which does not require the viewer to wear special equipment such as polarization glasses in order to see three-dimensional images, and which can display the three-dimensional images on a large screen using display units having a relatively simple construction. However, referring to independent claims 4, 11, 13, 15 and 17, although Ishimoto generally describes dividing image into a plurality of images, Ishimoto is silent as to teaching or suggesting, "dividing the three-dimensional space into movable planes or solid spaces" and "selecting and highlighting object data positioned within the divided planes or solid spaces". It is respectfully requested that independent claims 4, 11, 13, 15 and 17 be allowed.

In the Office Action, at page 8, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Stolarz and Tsuda. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The description presented above of Tsuda is incorporated herein. As to independent claim 5, Tsuda fails to teach or suggest, "when the vantage point is changed, the three-dimensional space data production unit redraws the object according to the changed vantage point," as recited in independent claim 5. It is respectfully requested that independent claim 5 be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.



Creation date: 10-21-2004
Indexing Officer: DDERBY - DAVID DERBY
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 09810412

Legal Date: 03-01-2004

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	LET.	1
2	A...	1
3	CLM	8
4	REM	7

Total number of pages: 17

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on